AFP American Free Press
Volume V #26 June 27, 2005 americanfreepress.net

 Phony War On Domestic "Terror" Exposed ***by Michael Collins Piper***

The War on Political Freedom

Feds Prepare to Wage All-Out War on Domestic Dissidents, So-Called Extremists; Former FBI Agent Claims Even 'Grumpy Old Geezers' Could Be Threat to America

By Michael Collins Piper



On May 29 ***The Washington Post*** revealed that the Bush administration was redirecting its vaunted "war on terrorism" toward a new "strategy against violent extremism." Then, one week later, on June 5, the ***Post*** featured a prominently placed commentary by a former FBI agent — who specialized in infiltrating "right wing" dissident groups in the United States — proposing that federal authorities begin efforts to wage all-out warfare against perceived domestic "extremist" groups.

The former FBI agent contended that the American "extremist" groups are a breeding ground for violence and therefore need to be dealt with essentially as a criminal conspiracy. "Behind the lone terrorist, a pack mentality," read the headline on Mike German's commentary.

German made it clear that the "domestic terrorist" groups that he says need special treatment are a diverse group. He pulled no punches in his description of those whom he perceives as the extremists. He says they are not just those who might "look" like extremists. German wrote:

> They don't always call themselves the KKK or the militia; they sometimes use benign names that mask their true nature. They might wear nazi symbols right on their sleeves, but they might not. They could be just a couple of grumpy old geezers who meet for coffee at a local cafe, or a few young punks looking for trouble, or even one guy sitting in his basement chatting on neo-nazi web sites. But they are all part of an underground extremist community.

However, said German, "every once in a while, a follower of these movements bursts violently into our world, with deadly consequences." He cited a number of individuals
who committed violent crimes and who had, in media jargon, been "linked" to a variety of so-called "extremist" groups.

And while there are undoubtedly many such organizations that might well be considered "extremist," German does not lay down the lines of demarcation as to what constitutes "extremism" versus presumably respectable expressions of freedom of speech. Here's where it gets even more disturbing. German asserted that:

> The fact that these individuals, after being exposed to extremist ideology, each committed violent acts might lead a reasonable person to suspect the existence of a wider conspiracy. Imagine a very smart leader of an extremist movement, one who understands the First Amendment and criminal conspiracy laws, telling his followers not to depend on specific instructions. He might tell them to divorce themselves from the group before they commit a violent act; to act individually or in small groups so that others in the movement could avoid criminal liability. This methodology creates a win-win situation for the extremist leader — the violent goals of the group are met without the legal consequences.

In other words, German is suggesting, anytime an individual who has been "linked" to an "extremist" group may commit a crime, it is not beyond logic to suspect that the group or its leaders actually instigated the crime; effectively, the constitutionally protected free expression by an individual or group, which might have somehow influenced another party to carry out a violent act, must be addressed. In short: it's time to start cracking down on those who are found guilty not of a crime, but only of "extremism," however defined.

It's a conspiracy by the extremists, according to German, and he added that, "to close our eyes to this conspiracy is to deny reality. It's a matter of connecting the dots."

Claiming that "Neo-nazi ideology is also a leading influence in rising school violence"— quite a stretch of the truth, and one that ignores the increasing use of psychiatric drugs in treating school kids, which often leads to depression and violence — German cited only two cases that are even vaguely linked to "neo-nazi" ideology.

The first instance German cited was the recent school shooting in Minnesota where a young American Indian, who evidently was an admirer of Adolf Hitler, killed several people and then himself.

German also hypes the essentially discredited claim that the Columbine High School shooting was inspired by a devotion to the National Socialist leader. However, what German fails to note is that one of the Columbine killers was the scion of a Jewish family prominent in Jewish community affairs in Columbus, Ohio.

In addition, it should be noted parenthetically that a prominent psychiatrist, Dr. Robert John, strongly believes, based on his own study, a theme that another educator, Dr. Phillip Glidden, echoed in his own book, ***Trading on Guilt***, that increasing "Holocaust studies" in the public schools are actually contributing to violence among young people by desensitizing them to violence through the constant display of images of violence.

In any case, German flatly asserted that "by providing both the motive and method for violence," these leaders [of "extremist" groups] who have supposedly "devised a method of masking their influence" are therefore "part of the conspiracy" to commit acts of violence.

"Their cynical reliance on First Amendment rights, which they would not grant others, does not negate their role," German wrote.

German concluded: "Lone extremists pose a challenge for law enforcement because they are difficult to predict. It's like searching every haystack for a needle. Perhaps we'd have better luck if we paid more attention to the needle factories."

What makes German's message so chilling is that it has an eerie echo of long-standing claims by the Anti- Defamation League (ADL) of B'nai B'rith — which touts itself as a "watchdog" keeping an eye on "extremist" groups — that political commentary to which the ADL objects constitutes "obscenity." Such "obscenity," they argue, can lead to violence.

For example, in 1988 at Hofstra University in New York, the ADL conducted a three-day legal symposium entitled "Group Defamation and Freedom of Speech: The Relationship Between Language and Violence." The forum concluded with a rousing call for passage of a law to ban what was described as "hate literature" by so-called "extremists."

The opinions expressed by the featured speakers advocating a ban on hate literature centered around two ideas:

• Words, written or spoken, constitute violence. (For example, one need only call someone a name without threatening any physical action to perform an act of violence.)

• Words, written or spoken, take on a certain power that creates a reality for the target or victim of these words. (For example, by calling someone a "dirty rotten bum," he will become one.)

In his opening remarks, Hofstra law professor Monroe Freedman said that trying to defend free speech while trying to protect minorities against those who "defame" them is a "paradox of constitutional democracy." According to Freedman:

> Group defamation can create a social climate that is receptive to and encourages hatred and oppression. If a minority group can be made to appear less than human, deserving of punishment, or a threat to the general community, oppression of that minority is a likely consequence.
>
> We know also that language itself can hurt, that there are words that, by their very utterance, inflict injury . . . When the message is violent, language can itself be violence.

Rep. John Conyers (D-Mich.), another featured speaker, described what he called "psychic pain" inflicted by language.

Another speaker, self-described "Holocaust survivor" Elie Wiesel, injected his opinion that those engaging in group defamation should be "fought" and "dealt with harshly."

The conference featured a moot court argument of the winning submission of a competition among law students around the nation to write a model statute that could be used to prosecute those who engage in so-called "group defamation." The first prize winner was a statute defining group defamation as:

> Any oral, written or symbolic speech, published with malice that debases, degrades or calls into question the loyalties, abilities or integrity of members of a group based on a characteristic that is allegedly common to the members of that group, or that by its very utterance inflicts injury upon members of a group, or that promotes animosity against a group.

A "group" was defined as "an aggregation of people identified by a common race, religion, national origin, ethnicity, or gender, or based upon heterosexuality or homosexuality."

Under the proposed statute, a government agency would be established to monitor acts of group defamation; assess the impact of any speech that defames a group; and counteract the actually and potentially adverse effects of that speech. That agency would also review all films and movies before they could be shown and, if deemed to be offensive, ban public viewing.

At the time, correspondents who are now working for ***American Free Press*** were alone in reporting on this remarkable forum. But on Nov. 2, 1995, then-Rep. (now U.S. Senator) Charles Schumer (D-N.Y.) joined with Conyers in promoting legislation of the character proposed at the ADL conference.

The Schumer measure, H.R. 2580, was deceptively called "The Republican Form of Government Guarantee Act."

A long-time ADL ally in Congress, Schumer proposed to outlaw discussion of what he called "baseless conspiracy theories regarding the government" that he said endangered public order. Although Schumer is best known as the leading congressional enemy of the Second Amendment and the rights of gun-owners, Schumer's new target — the First Amendment — would have effectively been scrapped if the bill had been passed.

Under the proposed legislation, Schumer wanted to set up a formal, official police state apparatus to silence and control government critics.

POLICE STATE

The correspondents for the now defunct populist newspaper, ***The Spotlight***, concluded that Schumer's proposal might have been the most dangerous police-state
legislation ever introduced in an American Congress as of that time and promptly launched an effort to defeat the bill. Although the ADL pressed hard for the measure, public pressure stimulated by ***The Spotlight*** resulted in the ADL scheme being rejected.

That first ADL-sponsored conspiracy against freedom of speech has, of course, been egregiously surpassed by the now-infamous Patriot Act, which, even as this is written,
the Bush administration — with the support of the ADL — is trying to expand. This comes at the time when the Bush administration is declaring its new war on "violent extremism" and a former FBI agent has come forth asserting the need to fight what he sees as a "conspiracy" among political dissidents to stir up violence.

Do not be surprised to find a growing media focus on "violence by extremists in America" calling for American law enforcement to be more vigilant in dealing with those deemed to be "out of the mainstream" and therefore potentially violent.

In light of all this, it's no coincidence, for example, that the ADL maintains what it calls a "Law Enforcement Agency Resource Network." Through this network the ADL recently cited the May 20-22 conference in New Orleans conducted by former state Rep. David Duke of Louisiana as the type of "extremist" activity that needs to be monitored. This announcement came despite the fact that Duke and others in attendance specifically and repeatedly renounced violence and angry rhetoric. But in the view of one such as ex-FBI man German, Duke and other leaders are simply sending out evil messages designed to insulate themselves and, at the same time, encourage violence.

Obviously, as a former FBI agent detailed to infiltrating "extremist" groups, German was certainly working closely — during his many years in the field — with the ADL, which has long had an intimate relationship with the FBI Their connection goes back to the years prior to World War II when the ADL was a prime instigator of the infamous "Great Sedition Trial" of patriotic Americans whose only crime was to stand in opposition to Franklin D. Roosevelt's drive to commit the United States to war against the Axis powers.

The Bush administration is moving toward a fight against "violent extremism" at a time when the ADL and other pro-Israel lobby groups are making the claim that American critics of Israel are lending moral aid and support to Islamic extremists by making statements critical of Israel. So, it appears as though German's commentary in ***The Washington Post*** is nothing less than a proverbial trial balloon, setting the stage for future endeavors to destroy political dissidents in America who dare to criticize the global war-mongering and pro-Israel extremism of the so-called "high priests of war" who dominate policymaking in the Bush administration.

Sidebar quote:
"What makes the FBI man's message so chilling is that it has an eerie echo of claims by the ADL that political commentary to which the ADL objects constitutes `obscenity.'"

Photographs numbered (1) to (6). They include a burning Branch Davidian building in Waco, TX and an anthrax lab scene, as described below.

Caption: **"History Proves U.S. Government Up to Its Neck in Domestic Terror** Although President Bush launched an all-out "war on terrorism," what he does not seem eager to address is the fact that most recent major incidents of domestic terrorism have had a definitive "federal connection." The president and his supporters in such groups as the Anti-Defamation League (ADL) of B'nai B'rith are eager to clamp down on folks who dare to criticize government policies. Dissent in America is being called "unpatriotic" and considered subversive, particularly when people raise questions about a wide variety of major crimes involving U.S. government perfidy and cover-up. Shown at right: 1. U.S. tanks roll into Waco, Texas, to participate in the bloody Holocaust and murder of innocent men, women and children, all members of the Branch Davidian Church. 2. Randy Weaver, whose wife and son were killed by federal marksman after a siege of his family's cabin, points to a photo in court. 3. A man inspects a hole created by a bomb during the first attack on the World Trade Center which was orchestrated by a terrorist cell known to have been penetrated by both the FBI and the intelligence service of our "ally," Israel. 4. The demolition of the Murrah Building in Oklahoma City. The whole truth about the Oklahoma bombing has yet to emerge, but we do know government agents were involved in the tragedy. 5. The WTC burns on 9-11. Officially sanctioned cover-up of what really happened — including the involvement of Israel and traitorous activities by collaborators in our own government — is being unraveled by independent investigators with the support of AFP. 6. And then there is the infamous anthrax attacks that came after 9-11. Although the FBI has terrorized one man for years without arresting him — and few believe he is guilty of the crime — there is strong evidence pointing toward a Muslim-hating government-connected scientist known as a supporter of Israel. Whoever "set up" the anthrax attacks tried to make it look as though "evil Muslims" were responsible."

A journalist specializing in media critique, Michael Collins Piper is the author of ***Final Judgment***, the controversial "underground bestseller" documenting the collaboration of Israeli intelligence in the assassination of John F. Kennedy. He is also the author of ***The High Priests of War***, ***The New Jerusalem***, ***The Judas Goats***, and ***Dirty Secrets***, all available from America First Books and First Amendment Books. He has lectured on suppressed topics in places as diverse as Malaysia, Japan, Canada, Russia and Abu Dhabi.